

Serial No. 09/897,972  
Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2004  
Reply dated: June 25, 2004

Docket No. P-200

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 4-8, 10, 12 and 15 are amended and claims 22-24 are added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 15 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Svennesson et al.; and claims 2-4, 8, 13, 14, 16 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Svennesson et al in view of Eaton et al.

Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Svennesson et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of providing a conference call supplemental service in an intelligent network, which includes setting a route between a service switch point (SSP) and an intelligent peripheral (IP), and then announcing the conference call supplemental service to a subscriber using the route between the SSP and the IP, and collecting and processing subscriber information. Independent claims 9 and 15 include similar features in a varying scope.

Thus, the IP performs the service announcement directly to the SSP, rather than the SCP performing the call announcement. As noted in the Background of the Related Art, the

conventional conference call service does not use a specific resource of the IP, and is provided in the form of only an accept conference request message and reject conference request message of a conference treatment indicator between the SSP and the SCP (see page 3, paragraph [10]).

The outstanding Office Action indicates Svennesson et al. teach announcing the service to a subscriber using the route between the SSP and the IP and cites col. 13, lines 40-53. However, the description in col. 13, lines 40-53 describe the features shown in Fig. 10 in which the IP 911 invokes a set up call with the SCP 901. That is, the IP 911 issues a set up call command to the SCP 901 upon which the SCP sets up the call to one or more subscribers and confirms the same to the IP 911. However, it is respectfully noted the IP in Fig. 10 is not directly communicating with the SSP but is communicating with the SCP. That is, the SCP in Svennesson et al. is responsible for announcing the service to a subscriber, whereas the IP according to the present invention announces the service to a subscriber using the route between the SSP and the IP.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 9, 15 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably define over Svennesson et al.

Claims 2-4, 8, 13, 14, 16 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Svennesson et al. in view of Eaton et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Serial No. 09/897,972  
Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2004  
Reply dated: June 25, 2004

Docket No. P-200

These claims depend on the independent claims discussed above. Further, it is respectfully noted Eaton et al. also does not teach or suggest announcing a service to a subscriber using the route between the SSP and the IP. Therefore, it is respectfully requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

Further, the specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. It is believed no new matter has been added.

In addition, new claims 22-24 have been added to set forth the invention in a varying scope, and Applicant submits the new claims are originally supported by the originally filed specification. In particular, new claim 22 is similar to claim 1, but does not include all the features recited in claim 1 and has been drafted in a varying scope. Dependent claim 23 includes the features not recited in claim 24 which are in claim 1 and new claim 24 corresponds to dependent claim 7. It is respectfully submitted these claims are allowable for similar reasons as discussed above.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the

Serial No. 09/897,972  
Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2004  
Reply dated: June 25, 2004

Docket No. P-200

application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David A. Bilodeau**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.  
Registration No. 36,186  
David A. Bilodeau, Esq.  
Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3701 DYK/DAB:knv  
**Date: JUNE 25, 2004**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**

\\fk4\Documents\2000\2000-104\32734.doc